



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/466,987	12/10/1999	DONALD F. GORDON	19880-000810	1815---

26291 7590 01/20/2004

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P.
595 SHREWSBURY AVE
FIRST FLOOR
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/466,987

Applicant(s)

GORDON ET AL.

Examiner

Vivek Srivastava

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori et al (6,191,782 – previously cited).

Regarding claim 2, Mori discloses an interactive program channel showing which programs will be broadcast (see col 6 lines 52-63) and thus discloses the claimed interactive program guide limitation. Mori further discloses a plurality of video transport streams, wherein video elements have a common packet identifier (see col 24 lines 42-54, col 6 lines 52 – col 7 line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludvig (6,415,437, previously cited) in view of Wasilewski (5,420,866).

Considering claim 1, Ludvig discloses a plurality of transport streams each comprising interactive guide pages (col 6 lines 43-46, col 8 lines 17-34). Ludvig further discloses that guide pages can be scrolled in sequence, i.e., channels 1-10 on one page and channels 11-20 (see col 8 lines 17-50). Since the streams are all program guide pages providing programming for a given time range (see fig 5A-5C) and since the program guide pages can be scrolled in sequence, the guide pages are all related by time and in order of sequence (see col 8 lines 17-50).

Ludvig fails to disclose the claimed grouping elementary streams with related IPG pages within a common transport stream. Wasilewski discloses a group of related elementary streams which are part of a transport stream can be extracted to produce a complete program (see col 2 lines 30-62). It would have been obvious modifying Ludvig to include grouping the elementary streams would have enabled all the related IPG

Art Unit: 2611

pages to be transported in the common transport stream would have enabled a faster simpler means for producing and displaying related IPG pages.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 – 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Guo et al (6,173,330) – Delivery and acquisition of data segments

Mori et al (6,191,782) – Method for displaying IPG information at high speeds

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308- 5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2611

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is
(703) 305 - 4038.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to
5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, Andy Faile, can be reached at (703) 305 - 4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number
is (703) 305 - 3900.

1/10/04

VS



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER